



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,404	11/24/2003	Christopher Hyland	LOT920030068US1 (022)	4110

46321 7590 10/11/2007
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/720,404	Applicant(s) HYLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Nathan Hillery	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 8/9/07.
2. Claims 1 – 21 are pending in the case. Claims 8 – 21 have been elected for examination at this time. Claims 8 and 15 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alston et al. (US 20020165936 A1), and further in view of Helgeson et al. (US 20020049749 A1).
5. **Regarding independent claim 8**, Alston et al. teach that subscribers are presented with a list of predefined page templates from which subscribers may choose to customize their Web sites (paragraph block 0060), which meet the limitation of **retrieving a specified template for producing a desired report**;

Alston et al. teach that each predefined page template within a section is specified by subscribers by their providing the same input and output parameters (paragraph block 0061), which meet the limitation of **determining from said specified template a set of parameters required to produce said desired report**;

Alston et al. teach that the process engine contains logic and rules on how certain business services should be processed. For example, using the branding information and configuration information defined via the administration application, the process engine runs the underlying engine or logic to process orders, for example, stores the order record into the appropriate database, updates the counts available, and the like (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **for each parameter in said set, selecting a screen for providing a user interface through which a value can be established for said parameter, and embedding business rule enforcement logic in said selected screen; and,**

Alston et al. teach that each site flow definition, as selected by a subscriber, enables the e-commerce channel to maintain and determine the state of the Web page currently being presented to a user. This is important in ensuring that a customer may move from page to page in a subscriber's Web site without fear of losing transactional information. For example, certain state information concerning a customer's session must be preserved as the customer visits pages (paragraph block 0056), which meet the limitation of **saving each of said selected screens in a report definition configured to produce a report while executing said embedded business rule enforcement logic to enforce the business rules in respect to values established for corresponding ones of the parameters in the set.**

Alston et al. do not explicitly teach **the business rule enforcement logic enforcing business rules for accessing data in a database.**

Helgeson et al. teach that Model pages are responsible for producing an XML representation of the content of the page. This content typically comes from executing complex business logic (e.g., running database queries) (paragraph block 0772), which meet the limitation of **the business rule enforcement logic enforcing business rules for accessing data in a database.**

Because both Alston et al. and Helgeson et al. teach methods of processing business logic, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of processing business logic in order to access data in a database.

6. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Alston et al. teach that based on the branding information supplied by the subscriber, particularly the flow, the on-demand site application knows what Web pages are to be presented to the user and in what order (paragraph block 0082), which meet the limitation of **storing an order of presentation for said selected screens in said report definition.**

7. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Alston et al. teach that each site flow definition, as selected by a subscriber, enables the e-commerce channel to maintain and determine the state of the Web page currently being presented to a user. This is important in ensuring that a customer may move from page to page in a subscriber's Web site without fear of losing transactional information. For example, certain state information concerning a customer's session must be preserved as the customer visits

pages. The different predefined flows from which a subscriber makes selections must be programmed such that customer session state information is available for needed e-commerce processing regardless of the route used by the customer to arrive at a processing page (paragraph block 0056), which meet the limitation of **retrieving said report definition; rendering each of said selected screens in said stored order; collecting parameter values for said parameters in said set through said rendered screens while limiting said parameter values according to said embedded business rule enforcement logic; and, generating said report based upon said collected parameter values.**

8. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, Alston et al. teach that certain state information concerning a customer's session (such as shopping basket information and product searches) must be preserved as the customer visits pages. The different predefined flows from which a subscriber makes selections must be programmed such that customer session state information is available for needed e-commerce processing regardless of the route used by the customer to arrive at a processing page (paragraph block 0056), which meet the limitation of **identifying session state data through said rendered screens; processing said session state data to limit data input through form fields in said screens; and, accepting data input through said form fields to establish said parameters.**

9. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Alston et al. teach that rules, constraints, and default values may be defined to limit the configuration combinations that may be selected and searched by customers. Each attribute may be ranked (an "attribute order"), as desired by the subscriber (paragraph block 0072), which meet the limitation of **identifying an end user through said session state data; limiting a range of data which can be accessed in said report based upon an identity of said end user as processed through said embedded business rule enforcement logic; and, reflecting said limited range of data through data input restrictions applied to said form fields in said screens.**

10. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, Alston et al. teach that the process engine of the e-commerce channel is a set of software applications that uses the branding information and the configuration information, and other appropriate data stored in the central e-commerce channel, to handle a business service provided by the e-commerce system (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **saving said report for subsequent reuse.**

11. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, Alston et al. teach that the process engine contains logic and rules on how certain business services should be processed. For example, using the branding information and configuration information defined via the administration application, the process engine runs the underlying engine or logic to process orders, for example, stores the order record into the appropriate database,

updates the counts available, and the like (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **loading said saved report; determining session state data for an end user loading said saved report; applying at least one business rule comparable to a business rule reflected in said embedded business rule enforcement logic to said session state data; and, modifying said saved report to enforce said at least one comparable business rule.**

12. **Regarding claims 15 – 21**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 8 – 14 and re rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8 – 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2176

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176

NH

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100